1985

An Investigation of Effectiveness of Three Methods of Presentation of Celebrity Endorsers on Product Recall and Product Image in Print Advertising

Christina. Mayers-Drumm
University of Central Florida

AN INVESTIGATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF THREE METHODS OF PRESENTATION OF CELEBRITY ENDORSERS ON PRODUCT RECALL AND PRODUCT IMAGE IN PRINT ADVERTISING

BY

CHRISTINA MAYERS-DRUMM
B. A., University of Central Florida, 1978

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Master of Arts degree in Communication
in the Graduate Studies Program of the College of Arts and Sciences
University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Fall Term
1985

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to five very special people in my life.

To Robbie, for believing in me when I didn't believe in myself.

To Ashley, for that all too needed distraction, both wanted and unwanted.

To my mother, for her love and moral support.

To my sister, Pat. Her encouraging phone calls have meant as much to me, as I'm sure, they have to Ma Bell.

And in memory of my father, who always provided the challenge.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to acknowledge those special people who have helped me in reaching my goal for this thesis. Dr. Bob Davis for having the creative insight in developing this topic. Richard Dunn-Roberts for coming to my rescue when I needed a programmer. Maggie LeClair for her encouragement, her sense of direction, and for the task of typing my thesis. Donna Jerome for being such a dear friend; she burned the midnight oil with me, and kept me laughing despite the last moment pressure. Dr. Pete Fisher for telling me to "DO IT." And a special thanks to Dr. Burt Pryor, who gave of his own time and energy, for teaching what $p<.05$ really means.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The use of celebrities in advertisements is not a new phenomenon. Advertisers have touted celebrities as a means of achieving product and brand attention, recall and sales since the early 1930s, "When Fibber McGee shined up S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc.'s image and Johnny Weissmuller beat his chest for Wheaties" (Business Week, 1978, p. 77).

Not until the 1970s, however, was there an intensification for consumer consciousness by advertisers. The proliferation of new products showed advertisers the advantage of hiring celebrities to help promote products. The management of Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. witnessed such an advantage:

> When a Goodyear Service store in downtown Pittsburgh couldn't draw customers, the division president . . . sent racer A. J. Foyt and four other celebrity racers to the service store. Each spent a day meeting the public, signing autographs, and posing for photos. In five days, 12,000 people visited the store causing sales to skyrocket. (Bragg, 1980, p. 32)

Advertisers contend famous names "imbue otherwise mundane products with credibility, trustworthiness and excitement" (Bronson, 1983, p. 60). A study by Gallup and Robinson, Inc., "reports that there has been more than a 70% increase over the

last decade in the use of movie, television, entertainment and sports stars on prime-time television commercials" (Arbose, 1981, p. 24).

Despite the proliferation of celebrities in ads, little empirical research has been conducted on the impact of celebrity endorsements. Marketers do study celebrity usage as it relates to their companies' products, but pertinent information effecting advertising strategies is usually kept secret (Kamen, Azhari & Kragh, 1975).

RELATED LITERATURE REVIEW

Over the past 30 years social psychologists have conducted research demonstrating that a source perceived as highly credible is more persuasive than a low credibility sender (Hovland & Weiss, 1951). Advertising practitioners have applied this information to creating advertisements around celebrities who promote various products. Along the way, however, advertisers have had to work hard to make the use of celebrities successful. The main criticism, it seems, is that "celebrities get attention but distract from the brand message" (Arbose, 1981, p. 25).

Marketers devote much of their research to "positioning their products, defining their target audiences and selecting benefits set forth in advertisements" (Ogilvy & Raphaelson, 1982, p. 14). In the process, marketers now know some 85% of magazine readers recall seeing an advertisement the day after they have seen it (Ogilvy & Raphaelson, 1982, p. 14). Ogilvy and Raphaelson claim this kind of pertinent data is not cumulative because advertisers and agencies usually do not keep their test scores and analyze them to discern which advertising techniques work best. Therein lies a problem.

Despite the frequent use of famous endorsers in the print media, there is little published evidence regarding celebrity

effectiveness. The handful of researchers interested in shedding some scholarly light on this problem have focused on the use of a celebrity as a credible source of an advertising message. In the Kamen et al. (1975) study, the marketing researchers investigated the use of Johnny Cash as a spokesman for Amoco Oil. It was the first time Amoco had used a celebrity figure to promote its product.

The authors define the function of a spokesman as ". . . serving as a core around which the substantive messages are positioned" (Kamen et al., 1975, p. 18). The authors hoped that a spokesman for the product would "trigger the past associations with the sponsor and stimulate the remembering of past messages" (p. 18).

While most of the study's conclusions were given to Amoco advertising strategists only, the study did reveal that a spokesman is effective "in heightening awareness of advertising and achieving perpetual restructuring of even a long-established brand" (p. 24).

Fireworker and Friedman (1977) chose to examine the effect of product endorsement claims on a consumer's decision-making process. The authors provided definitions for the four types of endorsements as defined by the Federal Trade Commission, however, for the purposes of this paper, only the celebrity endorser definition is salient. "A celebrity endorser is an individual known to the public (actor, sports figure, entertainer, etc.) for his achievements in areas other than that of the product class being endorsed" (Fireworker and Friedman, 1977, p. 576).

At the time Fireworker and Friedman conducted their study, they found pertinent information pertaining to celebrity effectiveness from two sources. A study by Daniel Starch (cited in Fireworker and Friedman, 1977, p. 578) found that celebrity testimonial advertisements are seen and read more than nontestimonial advertisements.

In addition, a survey conducted by Alan R. Nelson Research found the following:

> The study rated 192 sports personalities on four attributes: public awareness of personality, admiration of talent and ability, likeableness, and trust in endorsement. The Nelson study concluded that likeability is the most important characteristic of a celebrity endorser in determining the success of a testimonial ad. (cited in Fireworker and Friedman, 1977, p. 578)

The Fireworker and Friedman study purported to measure consumer acceptance of a new brand of wine when actually the study was measuring the effectiveness of five types of endorsements including the celebrity endorser. Their results showed that the celebrity endorser was successful, but not to the degree they hypothesized.

The 1979 Friedman and Friedman study investigated whether or not the effectiveness of an endorser type is dependent upon the type of product being endorsed. The results indicated that advertisers need to give more thought to the type of endorser used

in advertising their products. Friedman and Friedman found that if brand-name and advertisement recall are most desirable, then advertisers need to use a celebrity as an endorser. "If, on the other hand, believability of the endorsement, overall attitude toward the advertised product, and initial intent to purchase the advertised product are desired" (Friedman and Friedman, 1979, p. 71), using a celebrity endorser needs to be considered more carefully. The researchers also discovered that an advertiser needs to choose a celebrity for product endorsement if there is any psychological or social risk for the consumer purchasing the product. Friedman and Friedman define psychological and social risks, respectively, as "the chance that the product will cause the user physical harm /and/ the chance that the product will not fit well with the consumer's self-image (p. 65).

The most recent study addressing the question of the effectiveness of celebrity endorsers was conducted by Atkin and Block (1983). The authors narrowed their research to the impact of celebrity sources in the context of alcohol advertising in the print media. A celebrity and non-celebrity endorser were used in three versions of nearly identical pairs of advertisements. The authors hypothesized the following:

1. A celebrity source will have a greater impact than a non-celebrity source on responses to the advertisement and to the advertised product.

2. The celebrity will be seen as more credible.
3. The message will be rated more favorably along evaluative dimensions.
4. The respondents will have a more favorable attitude toward the celebrity-endorsed product and have greater intention to use it.
5. Adolescents will demonstrate the strongest response to the celebrity endorsers, relative to adults. (p. 58)

The experiment confirmed the hypotheses; the celebrity ads consistently produced significantly more favorable impact on the respondents than the non-celebrity ads (Atkin & Block, 1983).

Purpose

It is the purpose of this study to go one step further than Atkin and Block by varying the presentations of a celebrity endorser in a print advertisement.

Previous research of celebrities in print advertising has not addressed the possible relationship, if any, between celebrity-photo, celebrity-headline mention and celebrity-text mention. Most studies of print advertising measure its ability to attract attention, to have the ad read, and for it to stick in the memory (Ogilvy & Raphaelson, 1982).

Nobody has been able to correlate these measurements with sales, but it is reasonable to assume that an advertisement that people notice is more effective

> than one they pass by; that it is better if your ad is read thoroughly than if it is only glanced at; and that it is better still if readers can remember something of what they read. (Ogilvy & Raphaelson, 1982, p. 15)

The advertising strategists for a light-proof mixed drink called Campari sought to improve upon their "acquired taste" strategy of the 1970s (Holley, 1983, p. 83). They chose celebrity endorsers as a means to strengthen the Campari position in the liquor market. The 1980s theme, "Campari/The First Time's Never the Best" (p. 83), featured a selected celebrity whose name was mentioned in the headline, in the text, and a photo of the celebrity with the product was an integral part of the ad. Each celebrity chosen had to reflect the qualities of the brand and its consumer. Pretest and post test awareness studies measuring the campaign's ability to generate increased brand awareness revealed that brand awareness had increased dramatically and the advertising awareness level had doubled (Holley, 1983).

Summary of Literature

In summary, the Kamen, Azhari and Kragh study (1975) showed that a celebrity used as a spokesperson for a product is effective. Celebrity testimonial advertisements are seen and read more than nontestimonial advertisements (cited in Fireworker and Friedman, 1977). This was later confirmed by Atkin and Block (1983).

Further research showed that the most important characteristic for a celebrity endorsement is likeability of the celebrity (cited in Fireworker and Friedman, 1977) Friedman and Friedman (1979) pointed out the importance in considering the relationship between the celebrity and the product he/she is endorsing. They found that if brand name and advertisement recall are most desirable, then advertisers need to use a celebrity as an endorser.

It is clear that the manner in which a celebrity is used in an ad has not been researched or manipulated as a variable. The following study, then, proceeds one step further by examining three separate ways of using a celebrity spokesperson in print advertisements. Specifically:

1. Using a portrait photograph of a celebrity without mention of the celebrity's name.

2. Featuring the celebrity's name in a headline without the photo.

3. Running the celebrity's name in text with no photo or mention in the headline of the ad.

The study was designed to see which level of treatment has the greatest impact on brand recall and product image.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses for this study are:

1. The photo treatment for brand recall will be rated significantly higher than the headline and text treatments.

2. The headline treatment for brand recall will be rated higher than the text condition.
3. There will be an interaction between the sex of the respondents and the sex of the celebrity presenter which affects the manner in which they respond to the question on brand recall.
4. The photo treatment for product image will be rated higher than the headline and text treatments.
5. The headline treatment for product image will be rated higher than the text treatment.
6. There will be an interaction between the sex of the respondents and the sex of the celebrity presenter which affects the manner in which they respond to the question on product image.

METHODOLOGY

Design

This experiment is a 2 (celebrity status, female, and celebrity status, male) X 2 (respondent, female, male) X 3 (levels of celebrity treatment) post-test only design. The treatments were administered to six heterogeneous groups. Dependent measures were administered immediately after the treatments.

Pretest

Prior to conducting the experiment, a pretest was constructed in order to operationalize celebrity and product relevance for this study. See Appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire used in the celebrity/product selection.

The pretest was formulated by putting together a list of male and female celebrities who were chosen because they were not known for any product endorsements at the time of this study. This was to ensure that current or past associations with advertising campaigns would not influence the data from this study.

The questionnaire was administered to a heterogeneous group of students enrolled in a communication class at the University of Central Florida. The students were asked to rank 10 notable show business personalities in terms of celebrity status. (Five of the

personalities were female and five male to allow for control of the sex of the celebrity in the experimental design.) The subjects were also asked to associate products with each celebrity. Determining product relevance in the pretest was vital since prior research on celebrities in advertising has established that an appropriate relationship between product and spokesperson is an important factor for both recall and product image.

The 41 respondents ranked Burt Reynolds first among male celebrities and Dolly Parton was ranked first for female celebrities.

The pretest indicated that students most often associated Burt Reynolds with automotive products. Product association measures for Dolly Parton produced a tie between foods (more specifically, country foods) and lingerie products. For the purpose of this study, the lingerie product category was set aside in favor of food products. This choice limited sexual associations already surrounding Dolly Parton.

Stimulus Preparation

Fictitious products for the celebrities to represent were created to avoid any influence of current or past ad campaigns "Action Motor Oil" was developed for Burt Reynolds and "Country Home bacon" for Dolly Parton.

Photos of both celebrities were obtained from their agents. The photos were 8X10-inch, black and white, glossy publicity shots. There were cropped to roughly equal size and screened in a process camera to give them the appearance of printed photos.

The preparation of the stimulus for the three levels of celebrity treatments was as follows:

Stimulus 1 - The photos were used in creating stimulus one for the experiment. Two ads were created with exactly the same layout. These ads featured the photo and a bold headline asking the reader to "try Action Motor Oil (or Country Home bacon). An "Ayer's number one" format of headline under illustration was employed. This is a common layout format used in advertising. The typeface and type size were held constant. All-type logos, also using the same typefaces and sizes were created. Thus, both ads were exactly alike as they could be made with the exception of the celebrity in the photo. No text was used in this treatment. (See Appendix D.)

Stimulus 2 - For this treatment the two photos were replaced by headlines which begin with the celebrity's name. "Dolly Parton wants you to try Country Home bacon" and "Burt Reynolds wants you to try Action Motor Oil" were used. Headline size and configuration were exactly the same. Three paragraphs of text of approximately the same size were added. The same logos from stimulus one were used (see Appendix D).

Stimulus 3 - The third treatment features large headlines saying simply, "Try Country Home bacon" or, "Try Action Motor Oil." The text is the same as in stimulus two with the addition of a fourth paragraph that includes the celebrity recommendation (e.g. Action Motor Oil is the brand recommended by Burt Reynolds). Typeface, type size and logos were held constant (see Appendix D).

Every effort has been made in the preparation of the stimulus materials to control factors inherent in the graphic design of any print advertisement, including type size, layout format and logotype. Every effort was also made to design the ads to professional standards found in commercial advertising.

In order to effectively conduct the study, three blind ads which have appeared in past print advertising were selected. The blinds were chosen for their similar format to the stimulus ads. They were also chosen to eliminate any likelihood of their previous exposure to the study sample. The blind ads included an advertisement with a photo illustration for a phone sold by GTE in 1975; an ad for the City of Cincinnati, Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce; and an ad run by the Advertising Council concerning pride in the American work ethic (see Appendix E).

The same three blind ads were used to mask each stimulus/ treatment ad in all cells of the experimental design, thus preventing the blinds from affecting the data needed from the stimulus ads and allowing a clear comparison of the three forms of celebrity treatment.

To control exposure time for both the stimulus ads and the blinds, the ads were photographed for 35mm slides (see Technical Appendix B) and placed in a slide carousel. The slides were projected onto a screen so that the text of both stimulus ads and the blinds was clearly legible to students sitting in the back of the room.

Subjects

The subjects in this experiment were 167 students in various communication classes at the University of Central Florida. There was a predominance of females in each of the six cells except for one which was equally divided between male and female. The subjects in the cells were divided as follows:

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF SUBJECTS BY SEX PER TREATMENT

Cell	Treatment	Male	Female	Total
1	"Dolly" photo	7	27	34
2	"Dolly" headline	7	22	29
3	"Dolly" in text	6	17	23
4	"Burt" photo	9	16	25
5	"Burt" headline	9	21	30
6	"Burt" in text	13	13	26

Age of the subjects ranged from 19-years-old to over 22 which was designated on the questionnaire as "Other." Eighty-seven subjects fell into the "other" category. This amounted to just over one-half of the population. Two-thirds of the subjects' class rank was senior, 116, with the remaining 51 subjects divided among sophomore, 8, junior, 40, and, other, 3. Under class rank "Other" designated anyone beyond undergraduate level.

Procedure

Each of the six treatments was administered in the following manner:

1. The administrator gave a brief introduction, explaining only that the subjects would view slides and be asked to complete a two-page questionnaire.

2. The subjects then viewed four slides with each one being shown for one minute to allow enough time to read the ads. One of the four slides was a stimulus ad; the treatment was randomly assigned to each of the six classes participating to account for order effects. After viewing the four slides, the lights were turned on and the subjects were asked to complete Question 1 which contained three parts. Question 1 measured each respondent's ability to recall the ads.

3. The administrator then showed slide 5, which was left up on the screen. Subjects were asked to complete questions 2 through 5 while viewing slide 5, which was the stimulus ad repeated. Question 2 measured product image rating. Questions 3 through 5 provided demographic information (see Appendix C). All subjects were specifically asked not to discuss answers with their classmates or look at any question prior to the time allotted for answering.

Independent Variables

The stimulus materials consisted of six ads. These ads were created by a professional in the advertising field. The treatments

were "Dolly" photo, "Dolly" headline, "Dolly" in text, "Burt" photo, "Burt" headline, and "Burt" in text.

The male and female celebrity are the two independent variables in this study of which there are three levels of celebrity treatments: photo, headline, text (see Stimulus Appendix D).

The three blinds used in each of the six cells disguised each level of treatment for the male and female celebrity. Every attempt was made to keep the ads constant in ordering and exposure so as to allow for manipulation of only the treatment level and, thus, determine the effect of celebrities on brand recall and product image.

Dependent Variables

Two dependent measures were used. The first, on ad recall rating, was an open-ended question; respondents could say Yes or No but could also expound. The subjects viewed the four ads and then were asked to remember what each ad was for; if there was a brand name or advertiser mentioned in each ad; and could any details be recalled in each ad (see Appendix C).

A semantic differential scale with 13 items was used to measure the second dependent variable, product image rating. Thirteen pairs of polar-opposite adjectives anchoring the ends of a seven-step scale (see Appendix C) were used.

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to vary the presentations of a celebrity endorser in a print advertisement to see which level of treatment had the greatest impact on brand recall and product image. The research examined three separate ways of using a celebrity spokesperson. Specifically,

1. Using a portrait photograph of a celebrity without mention of the celebrity's name.
2. Featuring the celebrity's name in a headline without the photo.
3. Running the celebrity's name in a text with no photo or mention in the headline of the ad.

Two dependent measures were used to determine the effect of the stimulus material on the subjects. One recall instrument, the open-ended question for brand recall rating, and the product image instrument, a semantic differential scale, provided direct tests of the hypotheses.

Due to the 2 (sex of celebrity) X 2 (sex of respondent) X 3 (level of treatment) design, a three-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on both the brand recall and product image measures. It was necessary to conduct individual ANOVAs on the 13 pairs of polar opposite adjectives to ensure appropriate analysis. The ANOVAs data which

required further analysis via the Newman-Keuls method, which tests the differences between all pairs of means (see Appendix F for the Means and Newman-Keuls Analyses).

For ease of explanation, the following abbreviations for the celebrity/respondent/treatment combination as they relate to the means will be used: D = Dolly; B = Burt; F = Female; M = Male; P = Photo; H = Headline; and, T = Text.

Brand Recall Rating

The ANOVA conducted on the open-ended test of brand recall produced significant F ratios for the treatment conditions (F=5.08) the celebrity/treatment conditions (F=5.14).

Inspections of the means for the three treatments indicates the main effect is due to slightly higher mean ratings for the headline condition (2.47) as opposed to 2.09 for the photo and 1.92 for the text conditions.

A significant celebrity X treatment interaction was also obtained. The means are contained in Table 2.

TABLE 2

MEANS FOR CELEBRITY X TREATMENT INTERACTION ON BRAND RECALL

	Photo	Headline	Text
Dolly	1.66	2.58	1.89
Burt	2.53	2.37	1.96

Inspection of the means indicates Dolly was rated higher in the headline condition (2.58) than Burt (2.37). However, Burt was rated higher (2.53) than Dolly in the photo condition (1.66).

The individual cell means in the Newman-Keuls analysis (see Appendix F) indicates the headline condition produced the highest brand recall (BMH - 2.78; DFH - 2.59; DMH - 2.57). The photo condition for BRP (2.63) was higher than BMP (2.44) and DFP (2.04). Brand recall is significantly below every other group, including text, for DMP (1.28).

The results on brand recall failed to support hypothesis 1 which states that the photo treatment for brand recall will be rated significantly higher than the headline and text treatments. The results were consistent with hypothesis 2 which states that the headline treatment for brand recall will be rated higher than the text condition.

The celebrity X respondent condition showed a trend but was not significant at the .05 level, thus failing to support hypothesis 3. Comments pertaining to the open-ended question on brand recall indicated both male and female respondents more often remembered the celebrity but not the brand names.

Product Image Ratings

2.1 - Dislike-Like

The ANOVA produced significant F-ratios for the treatment condition (F=7.19) and celebrity X treatment interaction (F=5.19). An inspection of the means for the treatment condition indicates a main effect is due to high ratings in the photo condition (4.10). Headline

rated 2.96 and text, 3.25. The Newman-Keuls analysis (see Appendix F) shows the individual cell means for the photo condition (DMP-4.42; BFP=4.18; DFP=3.88; BMP=3.88) to be consistently higher in rating than the other two treatments while the headline and text treatments did not generally differ from each other.

A significant celebrity X treatment interaction was also obtained. The means are contained in Table 3 below:

TABLE 3

MEANS FOR CELEBRITY X TREATMENT INTERACTION ON DISLIKE-LIKE

	Photo	Headline	Text
Dolly	4.16	3.80	3.23
Burt	4.04	2.12	3.27

The interaction clearly indicates a significantly higher rating for the photo condition with Dolly being liked slightly more than Burt. Dolly's superiority in the headline condition is the reason for the significant interaction.

The results on the Dislike-Like dimension support hypothesis 4, which states that the photo treatment for product image will be rated higher than the headline and text treatments. Hypothesis 5 was not supported. It states that the headline treatment for product image will be rated higher than the text treatment. In this dimension, headline and text conditions were generally rated the same.

Hypothesis 6 was not supported. This hypothesis states that there will be an interaction between the sex of the respondents and the sex of the celebrity presenter which affects the manner in which they respond to the question on product image.

2.2 Bad-Good

Again, the ANOVA produced a significant F-ratio (F=6.50) for the celebrity X treatment interaction. The means are contained in Table 4.

TABLE 4

MEANS FOR CELEBRITY X TREATMENT INTERACTION ON BAD-GOOD

	Photo	Headline	Text
Dolly	3.90	3.82	3.28
Burt	3.78	2.03	3.69

A closer inspection of the individual cell means in the Newman-Keuls Analysis (see Appendix F) reveals that the appeal of the three levels of treatments is similar. Burt rated the lowest for both male and female respondents in the headline condition (BFH=2.28; BMH=1.77). Dolly rated the highest (4.14) in the photo condition. Again, Dolly's superiority in the headline only condition is the reason for the significant interaction. A trend suggests that if a headline is desired, do not use Burt as the celebrity.

The results failed to support hypotheses 4 and 5 in the Bad-Good dimension. Hypothesis 6 was not supported either as the respondents' gender had no significant bearing on the results.

2.3 Tasteless-Tasteful

Again, the ANOVA produced a significant celebrity X treatment interaction (F=3.13). The means are contained in Table 5.

TABLE 5

MEANS FOR CELEBRITY X TREATMENT INTERACTION ON TASTELESS-TASTEFUL

	Photo	Headline	Text
Dolly	4.17	4.37	4.39
Burt	4.47	3.25	4.12

An inspection of the means shows that Dolly was rated more positively in the headline and text conditions than Burt. However, Burt had the highest rating in the photo condition. The Newman-Keuls Analysis (see Appendix F) of the individual cell means shows that the groups did not generally differ from one another, suggesting that in the Tasteless-Tasteful dimension none of the treatments were that effective. Again, Dolly's superiority in the headline only condition is the reason for the significant celebrity X treatment interaction.

The results for the Tasteless-Tasteful dimension failed to support hypotheses 4 and 5. The sex of the respondent bore no positive correlation with the celebrity or treatment conditions, thus hypothesis 6 was not supported.

2.4 Dishonest-Honest

The ANOVA produced significant F-ratios in the celebrity (F-5.79) and treatment (F=10.20) conditions. An inspection of the celebrity main effect means shows Dolly (4.54) rated significantly higher than Burt (3.96). The main effect in the treatment condition rates the photo the highest (4.89) with text (4.30) second and headline last (3.55). Across the board Dolly was rated more honest than Burt, no matter what kind of interaction.

The results for the Dishonest-Honest dimension supported hypothesis 4 but not hypothesis 5. Respondents gender did not significantly affect the results, therefore hypothesis 6 was not supported. None of the interactions revealed significance.

2.5 Unpleasant-Pleasant

The ANOVA for the Unpleasant-Pleasant dimension produced three significant F-ratios in the celebrity (F=7.52), treatment (F=19.51), and celebrity X respondent conditions (F=5.39).

The celebrity main effect rates Dolly ($\bar{X}$=4.53) significantly higher than Burt ($\bar{X}$=3.93). Inspection of the treatment means indicate the main effect is due to high ratings in the photo condition (5.16), while headline and text treatment generally did not differ from each

other. The Newman-Keuls Analysis (see Appendix F) indicates that all conditions with photo have higher means and tend to differ significantly from the headline and text condition.

Additionally, a significant celebrity X gender interaction was obtained. The means are contained in Table 6.

TABLE 6

MEANS FOR CELEBRITY X RESPONDENT INTERACTION ON UNPLEASANT-PLEASANT

	Female	Male
Dolly	4.24	4.82
Burt	4.14	3.71

Inspection of the means indicate both male and female respondents rated Dolly more positively than Burt but the effect was accentuated for males. According to the Newman-Keuls Analysis (see Appendix F) the effect is due primarily to an extremely high mean (6.14) obtained in the DMP condition. This mean is significantly higher than the remaining 11 means. The results for the Unpleasant-Pleasant dimension support hypothesis 4, but not hypothesis 5. Respondents' gender did affect the responses to the celebrities; hypothesis 6 was not supported. Males see Dolly as more pleasant than females, showing a clear preference to Dolly.

2.6 Unbelievable-Believable

The ANOVA produced significant F-ratios for celebrity (F=6.25) and celebrity X treatment (F=3.61) in the Unbelievable-Believable dimension. Inspection of the celebrity main effect means clearly shows Dolly (4.57) as being more believable than Burt (3.94).

A significant celebrity X treatment interaction was obtained. The means are contained in Table 7.

TABLE 7

MEANS FOR CELEBRITY X TREATMENT INTERACTION ON UNBELIEVABLE-BELIEVABLE

	Photo	Headline	Text
Dolly	4.73	4.81	4.17
Burt	4.32	3.25	4.23

Inspection of the means indicate both male and female respondents rated Dolly as more believable. The Newman-Keuls Analysis (see Appendix F) shows the effect is due largely to a high mean (5.57) obtained in the DMP condition. The product image for BFH (2.61) is significantly below every other group, including text.

The results for the Unbelievable-Believable dimension do not support hypotheses 4 and 5 because of the skewed DMP mean. In this case the male respondents decidedly viewed Dolly as more believable in the photo condition producing the skewed mean. Yet hypothesis 6

was not supported. Dolly's superiority in the headline condition is the reason for the significant interaction.

2.7 Boring-Interesting

The ANOVA produced significant F-ratios for celebrity (F=6.96) and treatment (F=12.05) conditions. Inspection of the means indicates the two main effects are due to Dolly ($\bar{X}$=3.11) rating higher than Burt ($\bar{X}$=2.46); and to the significantly high rating in the photo condition ($\bar{X}$=3.61). The headline ($\bar{X}$=2.18) and text treatment ($\bar{X}$=2.57) did not generally differ from each other. An inspection of the Newman-Keuls Analysis (see Appendix F) indicates that the photo condition produced the higher ratings. The highest two means were DMP = 4.14 and DFP = 4.07, respectively. The order of the means suggest that text condition was rated as more interesting than the headline condition.

The results for the Boring-Interesting dimension supported hypothesis 4, but not hypothesis 5. Respondents' gender had no significant effect on the results, thus failing to support hypothesis 6. There is a trend developing, however, which shows males having a preference for Dolly in the photo condition.

2.8 Weak-Strong

The ANOVA on the Weak-Strong dimension produced one significant F-ratio for the celebrity condition (F=4.37). This main effect rated Dolly ($\bar{X}$=3.27) significantly higher than Burt ($\bar{X}$=2.69). The Newman-Keuls Analysis shows the DMP ($\bar{X}$=4.0) is the strongest on product image.

The results for the Weak-Strong dimension did not support hypotheses 4, 5 or 6. However, the continuing trend shows the male respondents reacting more favorably to Dolly in the photo condition than the female respondents.

2.9 Unenjoyable-Enjoyable

The ANOVA produced significant F-ratios in the celebrity (19.24) and celebrity X respondent X treatment (4.24) conditions.

Inspection of the celebrity means indicates the main effect is due to the photo condition ($\bar{X}$=4.36). The headline ($\bar{X}$=2.49) and text ($\bar{X}$=2.89) condition did not generally differ from each other.

A significant celebrity X respondent X treatment interaction was obtained. The means are contained in Table 8.

TABLE 8

MEANS FOR CELEBRITY X RESPONDENT X TREATMENT INTERACTION ON UNENJOYABLE-ENJOYABLE

	Sex	Photo	Headline	Text
Dolly	Female	4.15	3.55	2.94
	Male	5.0	2.14	3.0
Burt	Female	4.63	1.95	3.15
	Male	3.66	2.33	2.46

The three-factor interaction is best explained as follows: Both male and female respondents rated Dolly and Burt photo conditions as the most enjoyable (DMP = 5.0; BFP = 4.62; DFP = 4.14; DMP = 3.66) compared to all other groups. The text condition rated significantly higher than the headline condition (BFT = 3.15; DMT = 3.0; DFT = 2.94; BMT = 2.46). The photo condition is rated more enjoyable than headline or text, but the text is more enjoyable than the headline condition.

The results of the Unenjoyable-Enjoyable dimension supported hypotheses 4, 5 and 6. The interaction for this dimension shows the respondents' gender was an integral part of the ordering of cell means in the Newman-Keuls Analysis.

2.10 Ineffective-Effective

The ANOVA produced no significant F-ratios in the Ineffective-Effective dimension. While the data do not support hypotheses 4, 5 and 6, the trend shows the male respondents rating Dolly higher in the photo condition.

2.11 Unsexy-Sexy

The ANOVA produced a significant F-ratio (88.60) for the treatment condition. The main effect clearly rates the photo condition (F=4.98) the highest.

A celebrity X treatment interaction produced an F-ratio of 3.23. The means are contained in Table 9.

TABLE 9

MEANS FOR CELEBRITY X TREATMENT INTERACTION ON UNSEXY-SEXY

	Photo	Headline	Text
Dolly	5.34	1.57	1.40
Burt	4.63	1.62	2.15

Inspection of the means generally indicates a higher rating for the photo conditions for both Dolly and Burt. The Newman-Keuls Analysis (see Appendix F) shows a small superiority in the Dolly photo with means 5.85 and 4.81. These differ significantly from the Burt photo means (5.37 and 3.88). There is a reverse trend for the headline and text conditions, rating Burt higher than Dolly.

The results for the Unsexy-Sexy dimension support hypothesis 4. Hypotheses 5 and 6 were not supported. Respondents' gender produced no significance; however, the trend shows males have a preference for Dolly in the photo condition.

2.12 Complex-Simple

The ANOVA produced a significant F-ratio for the treatment condition ($F=20.36$). Inspection of the treatment means clearly shows a higher rating for the photo condition (6.27) while the headline (4.47) and text (4.27) did not generally differ from each other in the complex-simple dimension.

Inspection of the individual cell means in the Newman-Keuls Analysis (see Appendix F) indicates the photo condition produced the highest ratings in the first four positions (DMP = 6.71; BFP = 6.62; BMP = 5.88; DFP = 5.81). Respondents perceived these conditions to be more simple than all other conditions.

The results for the Complex-Simple dimension supported hypothesis 4 but not hypothesis 5 and 6. Again, respondents' gender produced no significance; however, the trend shows males have a preference for Dolly in the photo condition.

2.13 Unimportant-Important

The ANOVA produced no significant F-ratios in the Unimportant-Important dimension, thus failing to support hypotheses 4, 5 and 6.

In order to clarify the consistent findings produced by the 13 ANOVAs and Newman-Keuls Analyses for Product Image, a multivariate analysis, coupled with a Newman-Keuls Analysis, were conducted.

The MANOVA produced significant F-ratios in the celebrity (F=5.80), treatment (F=18.6), celebrity X treatment (F=3.54) and celebrity X respondent X treatment (F=3.79) conditions.

A significant celebrity X respondent X treatment interaction was obtained. The grand means are contained in Table 10.

TABLE 10

GRAND MEANS FOR CELEBRITY X RESPONDENT X TREATMENT INTERACTION ON PRODUCT IMAGE

	Sex	Photo	Headline	Text
Dolly	Female	53.11	51.18	42.1
	Male	63.29	41.28	45.50
Burt	Female	56.69	32	48.23
	Male	50.56	34.55	42.38

The results of the three-factor interaction show that in order to give an accurate prediction on product image it is necessary to look at all three variables as they interact together. The interaction is best explained as follows:

For females the male photo is best.

For males the female photo is best.

For females the female in headline is best.

For males the female in headline is best.

For females the male in text is best.

For males the female in text is best.

Both female and male respondents rated Dolly and Burt photo conditions as the best (DMP=63.29; BFP=56.69; DFP=53.11; BMP=50.56) compared to all other groups. The means for the text condition are

significantly higher overall than the headline condition (BFT=48.23; DMT=45.50; BMT=42.38; DFT=42.18).

The results of the MANOVA supported hypothesis 4: The photo treatment for product image will be rated higher than the headline and text treatments. Hypothesis 5, which states that the headline treatment for product image will be rated higher than the text treatment, was not supported. The celebrity X respondent X treatment interaction for product image shows the respondents' gender was an integral part of the ordering of cell means in the Newman-Keuls Analysis and, therefore, supported hypothesis 6.

It is important to note that while this study used a 2 X 2 X 3 design, the respondents' gender was not treated as an independent variable. The respondents served to suit the statistical analyses needed for an interpretation of the data.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Previous research showed that a celebrity used as a spokesperson for a product is effective. The most important characteristic of the celebrity is likeability. A positive relationship must exist between the celebrity and the product being advertised. In order to achieve the desired result of brand-name and advertisement recall, a likeable celebrity must be used in the endorsement.

The purpose of this study was to vary the presentations of a celebrity endorser in a print advertisement, by photo, headline, and text. The study was designed to see which level of treatment has the greatest impact on brand recall and product image.

The results on brand recall indicate the use of a headline in an advertisement is more effective than a photo when using a celebrity. However, the use of a photo is more successful for product recall than brand-name recall.

Product image results produced a definite preference for the photo condition in the following bipolar adjectives: Dislike-Like; Dishonest-Honest; Unpleasant-Pleasant; Unbelievable-Believable; Boring-Interesting; Unenjoyable-Enjoyable; Unsexy-Sexy; and Complex-Simple. Within these categories, Dolly is preferred over Burt in product image ratings.

Two bi-polar adjectives - Weak-Strong and Unenjoyable-Enjoyable - illicited a positive response for the text condition. Respondents thought the text better supported the product's image than the headline.

The MANOVA summed up the 13 semantic differential scales and clarified the ANOVA results on product image. The photo condition was considered most effective while the text was considered better than the headline treatment. However, it is important to note that the grand means for the Burt X Headline condition for both female and male respondents were possibly skewed; the respondents in this cell were in an advertising copy and campaigns class and, based on written comments, were more interested in the construction of the ad rather than the content. An inspection of the Newman-Keuls analysis supports this point; BMH and BFH were rated the lowest. It is suggested that future studies conducted in the advertising field use subjects from classes in other areas.

It is interesting to note that brand recall rating produced a higher interest in the headline, suggesting that the photo condition, particularly Dolly's, distracted from recalling the brand name. Respondents stressed this point in their questionnaire, repeatedly commenting on Dolly's "famous chest." A few respondents felt that the celebrity and product were poorly matched, thus effecting their ability to recall the brand. It is suggested that advertisers need to make sure the celebrity's attributes will not distract from recall of brand names as Dolly's did.

For future investigation in this area, it is suggested to use only the bi-polar adjectives found in Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum's (1957) evaluative dimension for the semantic differential scales. This dimension measures attitudes, and by doing so, not as many ANOVAs would have to be conducted.

It is suggested that the same administrator be used to administer the questionnaires. Different administrators increase the chance of the study being tainted thus affecting external validity.

This study's questionnaire was on one page, front and back, which proved unwise. Respondents were reading the entire questionnaire despite the fact that they were asked to view the stimulus material first. To prevent this from occurring in future studies, the questionnaire needs to be on separate pieces of paper and administered only after the stimulus material has been viewed.

While success was met by using Dolly and Burt in the celebrity treatment, the generalization should not be made that all female/male celebrities will produce the desired results. It is recommended to vary the celebrities to confirm the findings of this study.

APPENDIX A

PRETEST QUESTIONNAIRE

Below is a list of names which has been divided into two groups: Male Celebrities (Group 1) and Female Celebrities (Group 2). Each group contains five names. Please rank each person within each group in terms of how well-known they are to you. Ranking simply means to put in order by number (1 through 5) with 1 being the most well-known and 5 being the least well-known to you.

Next, what sort of products do you think these people would be effective in endorsing? Please place your product idea opposite each name.

For example, you might rate O. J. Simpson third on a list of five, and someone who would be effective selling rental cars.

Celebrity	Rank	Product Category
O. J. Simpson	3	Rental Cars

Please make sure that these two steps are applied to both groups.

GROUP 1

MALE CELEBRITIES	RANK	PRODUCT CATEGORY
Paul Newman	____	_____
Robert Redford	____	_____
Harrison Ford	____	_____
Clint Eastwood	____	_____
Burt Reynolds	____	_____

GROUP 2

FEMALE CELEBRITIES	RANK	PRODUCT CATEGORY
Meryl Streep	____	_____
Bo Derek	____	_____
Elizabeth Taylor	____	_____
Cher	____	_____
Dolly Parton	____	_____

APPENDIX B

TECHNICAL

Stimulus slides were made with a Contax, RTS II camera in a copy stand. The lens used was a Zeiss S-Planar, 60mm, F-2.8 (macro) with no filtration.

Film used was Kodak Ektachrome ASA 160 (tungsten), emulsion 5077-119 with tungsten lighting by 2 (500 watt) bulbs.

Photographic data for the stimulus ads:

Ad	Speed	F-stop	Enlargement ratio
"Dolly" photo	1/60	f/9.5	1/10
"Dolly" headline	"	"	"
"Dolly" in text	"	"	"
"Burt" photo	"	"	"
"Burt" headline	"	"	"
"Burt" in text	"	"	"

Photographic data for blinds:

Ad	Speed	F-stop	Enlargement ratio
GTE phone	1/60	f/13	1/5
Cincinnati	1/60	f/13	1/5
Ad Council	1/60	f/16	1/4

The technical data is provided to allow replication of the stimulus materials and the study. Enlargement of the stimulus ads is consistent to provide a consistent stimulus size on screen.

Enlargement of blind ads was adjusted to provide projected images at the same size and readability as the stimulus ads.

APPENDIX C

POST-TEST QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Ad Recall Rating

You have just viewed four advertisements. Please answer, to the best of your ability, the following questions concerning the four advertisements you have just seen.

1a. Do you remember what the ad was for:

Ad 1 _____

Ad 2 _____

Ad 3 _____

Ad 4 _____

1b. Do you remember seeing (or reading) the brand name or advertiser in:

Ad 1 _____

Ad 2 _____

Ad 3 _____

Ad 4 _____

1c. Do you remember any details from:

Ad 1 _____

_____

_____

_____

Ad 2 _____

_____

_____

_____

Ad 3 _____

_____

_____

_____

Ad 4 _____

_____

_____

_____

2. Product Image Rating

Please place a check mark somewhere along the seven-point scale below to show how you view the ad right now. Some of the pairs may seem unusual, that is, not exactly opposites, but you'll probably rate the ad one way more than another if you think about it carefully. For each pair, then, put a check mark closer to the adjective which best describes how you rate the product in the ad right now.

Example:

Sad ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Happy

Dislike ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Like

Bad ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Good

Tasteless ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Tasteful

Dishonest ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Honest

Unpleasant ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Pleasant

Unbelievable ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Believable

Boring ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Interesting

Weak ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Strong

Unenjoyable ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Enjoyable

Ineffective ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Effective

Unsexy ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Sexy

Complex ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Simple

Unimportant ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Important

3. Your age: /_/ 18
/_/ 19
/_/ 20
/_/ 21
/_/ Other (specify ___)

4. Sex: /_/ Male
/_/ Female

5. Your class rank: /_/ Freshman
/_/ Sophomore
/_/ Junior
/_/ Senior
/_/ Other (specify _____)

APPENDIX D

STIMULUS

Try
Country Home bacon.

Country Home
bacon

Try Country Home bacon.

Country Home Bacon is a unique taste treat based on modern farm technology. Each package of Country Home contains bacon from award winning farms. Farms which are known throughout their states for innovative hog raising and breeding techniques.

Country home bacon has been enjoyed in fine restaurants throughout the South. Restaurants whose reputations rest on serving the finest cuisine. Now you can enjoy the taste of this special bacon in your home.

Doesn't your family deserve the same kind of bacon thousands have enjoyed in fine restaurants? Look for Country Home Bacon in your store.

Country Home bacon is the brand recommended by Dolly Parton.

Country Home
bacon

Dolly Parton wants you to try Country Home bacon.

Country Home Bacon is a unique taste treat based on modern farm technology. Each package of Country Home contains bacon from award winning farms. Farms which are known throughout their states for innovative hog raising and breeding techniques.

Country home bacon has been enjoyed in fine restaurants throughout the South. Restaurants whose reputations rest on serving the finest cuisine. Now you can enjoy the taste of this special bacon in your home.

Doesn't your family deserve the same kind of bacon thousands have enjoyed in fine restaurants? Look for Country Home Bacon in your store.

Country Home
bacon

Try
Action Motor Oil.

Action
motor oil

APPENDIX E

BLINDS

Can anyone do what you do any better?

Probably not. All things considered you do what you do pretty doggone well. After all, no one has taken your job. And you're eating regularly. But...

But have you ever considered what doing your job just a little better might mean?

Money. Cold hard coin of the realm.

If each of us cared just a smidge more about what we do for a living, we could actually turn that inflationary spiral around. Better products, better service and better management would mean savings for all of us. Savings of much of the cash and frayed nerves it's costing us now for repairs and inefficiency.

Point two. By taking more pride in our work we'll more than likely see America regaining its strength in the competitive world trade arena. When the balance of payments swings our way again we'll all be better off economically.

So you see—the only person who can really do what you do any better is you.

America, it only works

1. BRAND RECALL*

BMH	BFP	DFH	DMH	BMP	DFP
2.0_{c}	1.95_{c}	1.94_{c}	1.92_{c}	1.83_{c}	1.28

2. PRODUCT IMAGE

2.1 Dislike-Like

DMP	BFP	DFH	DFP	BMP	DMH
4.42_{a}	4.18_{ab}	4.18_{abc}	3.89_{bc}	3.89_{bc}	3.42_{d}

2.2 Bad-Good

DFH	DMP	BFP	BFT	DFP	DMT
4.36_{a}	4.14_{ab}	4.12_{abc}	3.84_{bcd}	3.66_{bcde}	3.53_{def}

2.3 Tasteless-Tasteful

DMT	BFT	DFH	DMP	BMP	BFP
4.66_{a}	4.61_{ab}	4.95_{abc}	4.57_{abcd}	4.55_{abcde}	4.37_{abcdef}

2.4 Dishonest-Honest

DMP	BFT	DFP	DMT	BMP	BFP
6.14	4.69_{a}	4.51_{ab}	4.50_{abc}	4.44_{abcd}	4.43_{abcde}

2.5 Unpleasant-Pleasant

DMP	BFP	BMP	DFP	DFH	BFT
6.14	5.25	4.77_{a}	4.48_{ab}	4.23_{bc}	4.22_{bcd}

2.6 Unbelievable-Believable

DMP	DMH	DFH	BFT	BMP	DMT
5.57	4.85_{a}	4.77_{ab}	4.46_{abc}	4.33_{cd}	4.33_{cde}

BMT 2.0_{c}	BFH 1.95_{c}	DFT 1.94_{c}	BFT 1.92_{c}	DMT 1.83_{c}	DMP 1.28

2.1 (cont.)

BFT 3.38_{d}	DMT 3.33_{d}	BMT 3.15_{d}	DFT 3.11_{d}	BFH 2.24_{e}	BMH 2.0_{e}

2.2 (cont.)

BMT 3.50_{defg}	BMP 3.44_{defgh}	DMH 3.28_{defghi}	DFT 3.05_{fghi}	BFH 2.28	BMH 1.77

2.3 (cont.)

DMH 4.14_{bcdefg}	DFT $4.11_{bcdefgh}$	DFP 3.77_{ghi}	BMT 3.61_{ghij}	BFH 3.38_{ijk}	BMH 3.11_{jk}

2.4 (cont.)

DFH 4.31_{abcdef}	DFT $4.17_{abcdefg}$	BMT 3.84_{gh}	DMH 3.57_{hi}	BMH 3.22_{ij}	BFH 3.09_{j}

2.5 (cont.)

DMT 4.16_{bcde}	DMH 4.14_{bcdef}	DFT 4.0_{cdef}	BMT 3.46	BFH 2.95_{g}	BMH 2.88_{g}

2.6 (cont.)

BFP 4.31_{cdef}	DFT 4.0_{cdefg}	BMT 4.0_{cdefgh}	BMH 3.88_{defghi}	DFP 3.88_{defghi}	BFH 2.61

APPENDIX F

MEANS AND NEWMAN KEULS ANALYSIS FOR BRAND RECALL AND PRODUCT IMAGE

2.7 (cont.)

DFT	BMT	BFT	BMH	DMH	BFH
2.58_{ef}	2.53_{efg}	2.30_{fgh}	2.11_{h}	1.71_{i}	1.57_{i}

2.8 (cont.)

DFT	BMP	BMT	BMH	DMH	BFH
2.88_{cdef}	2.77_{cdefg}	2.69_{cdefgh}	2.44_{defghi}	$2.42_{defghij}$	2.14_{ij}

2.9 (cont.)

DMT	DFT	BMT	BMH	DMH	BFH
3.0_{bc}	2.94_{bc}	2.46_{d}	2.33_{de}	2.14_{def}	1.95_{f}

2.10 (Cont.)

BMP	DFP	DFT	DMH	BFH	BMH
3.22_{efg}	3.07_{fgh}	3.05_{fghi}	2.85_{ghij}	2.47_{jk}	2.22_{k}

2.11 (cont.)

DFH	BMH	BFH	DFT	DMT	DMH
1.86_{ab}	1.66_{abc}	1.57_{abcd}	1.47_{abcde}	1.33_{cdef}	1.28_{cdef}

2.12 (cont.)

BMH	DMT	DFH	DFT	BFT	BFH
4.22_{d}	4.16_{de}	4.04_{def}	4.0_{defg}	4.0_{defgh}	3.90_{defgh}

2.13 (cont.)

DMH	DFT	DMT	BMP	BMH	BFH
2.85_{bcdefg}	2.70_{cdefgh}	2.66_{defghi}	$2.66_{cdefghij}$	$2.66_{defghijkl}$	2.28_{hijk}

2.7 Boring-Interesting					
DMP	DFP	DFH	BFP	BMP	DMT
4.14_{a}	4.07_{a}	3.31_{b}	3.12_{bc}	3.11_{bcd}	2.83_{cde}
2.8 Weak-Strong					
DMP	DFH	DFP	BFT	DMT	BFP
4.0_{a}	3.68_{ab}	3.63_{ab}	3.15_{c}	3.0_{cd}	2.93_{cde}
2.9 Unenjoyable-Enjoyable					
DMP	BFP	DFP	BMP	DFH	BFT
5.0	4.62	4.14	3.66_{a}	3.54_{a}	3.15_{b}
2.10 Ineffective-Effective					
DMP	DFH	BFT	BFP	DMT	BMT
4.28_{a}	4.13_{ab}	4.0_{abc}	3.81_{bcd}	3.66_{bcde}	3.46_{cdef}
2.11 Unsexy-Sexy					
DMP	BFP	DFP	BMP	BFT	BMT
5.85	5.37	4.81	3.88	2.38	1.92_{a}
2.12 Complex-Simple					
DMP	BFP	BMP	DFP	BMT	DMH
6.71_{a}	6.62_{a}	5.88_{b}	5.81_{b}	4.92_{c}	4.71_{c}
2.13 Unimportant-Important					
DFH	BFT	DFP	BFP	DMP	BMT
3.59_{a}	3.38_{ab}	3.25_{abc}	3.18_{abcd}	3.14_{abcde}	3.0_{bcdef}

*Means with a common subscript in each row do not differ from each other at $p < .05$.

APPENDIX G

GRAND MEANS AND NEWMAN KEULS ANALYSIS FOR PRODUCT IMAGE

Grand Means and Newman Keuls Analysis for Product Image*

DMP

63.29 56.69 53.11_{a} 51.18_{a} 50.56_{ab} 48.23_{bc} 45.40_{cd} 42.38_{de} 42.18_{def} 41.29_{ef} 34.56_{g} 32.00_{g}

*Means with a common subscript in each row do not differ from each other at $p > .05$

REFERENCES

Arbose, J. R. Harnessing the appeal of celebrities and cartoon characters to boost sales. (1981). International Management, 36, 24-28.

Atkin, C., & Block, M. Effectiveness of celebrity endorsers. (1983). Journal of Advertising Research, 23.

The big new celebrity boom. (1978, May). Business Week, p. 77.

Bragg, A. J. Celebrities in selling - more than just tinsel. (1980). Sales and Marketing Management, 124, 30-36.

Bronson, G. In advertising big names mean big money. (1983). U.S. News & World Report, 60-61.

Fireworker, R. B., & Friedman, H. H. The effects of endorsements on product evaluation. (1977). Decision Science, 576-583.

Friedman, H. H., & Friedman, L. Endorser effectiveness by product type. (1979). Journal of Advertising Research, 19, 63-71.

Holley, J. Campari tells about its 'First Time' with Compton. (1983). Madison Avenue, 25, 82-83.

Hovland, C., & Weiss, W. The influence of source credibility on communication effectiveness. (1951). Public Opinion Quarterly, 15, 635-650.

Kamen, J. M., Azhari, A. C., & Kragh, J. R. What a spokesman does for a sponsor. (1975). Journal of Advertising Research, 15, 17-24.

Ogilvy, D., & Raphaelson, J. Research on advertising techniques that work - and don't work. (1982). Harvard Business Review. 60, 14-19.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. (1957). The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.